

Democratic Republican Nominations.

FOR PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES, GEN. LEWIS CASS, OF MICHIGAN.

FOR VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES, MAJ. GEN. WM. O. BUTLER, OF KENTUCKY.

Democratic Electoral Ticket.

- 1st District, THOMAS BRAY, Jr., of Northampton. 2d " ASA BIGGS, of Marin. 3d " FERRIN BUSHEE, of Wake. 4th " GEORGE S. STEVENSON, of Craven. 5th " WILLIAM S. ASHIE, of New Hanover. 6th " SAMUEL J. PETERSON, of Bladen. 7th " GAWWALLER JONES, Sr., of Orange. 8th " ROBERT P. DICK, of Rockingham. 9th " GREEN W. CALDWELL, of Mecklenburg. 10th " W. W. AVERY, of York. 11th " WILLIAM H. THOMAS, of Haywood.

ERROR.—In the communication on the 4th page, signed "SOUTHERN," a typographical error occurs. In the first paragraph for "Gods of Tiresias" read garb of Tiresias.

7.—We publish on the fourth page, a communication signed "a Southern," from the pen of one of our most intelligent citizens. The views it presents, we think will strike the reader as having a strong merit of originality. We have not examined the subject sufficiently to give our own opinion on the proposition presented by our correspondent.

8.—We call the attention of the reader to the proceedings of the Pittsboro' Convention, published on the fourth page. We had intended to make some remarks on the subject of improving the Cape Fear River, but our space is so limited, that it is out of our power. We trust that the people of the Cape Fear region will go on with spirit and promptitude and accomplish this great work.

MILLARD FILLMORE—IS HE AN ABOLITIONIST?

Under existing circumstances, it is fully as important to the South to ascertain with exactitude the political sentiments of the respective candidates for the Vice Presidency, particularly with reference to the slavery question, as to know what political opinions are held by those who aspire to the first office in the gift of American freemen.

As the question is so important, we are willing to admit, it is paramount to all others, to wit, the slavery question. To show how important it is to know with reasonable certainty the sentiments on this subject of the respective candidates for the Vice Presidency, it is only necessary to present a few facts. In the first place, there are at present thirty States in the Union, each of them represented on the floor of the Senate chamber by two Senators. This body (the U. S. Senate) is therefore composed of sixty members. Now, in the second place, of these thirty States 15, are slaveholding and 15 are non-slaveholding States. So that, should the slavery question assume a positive sectional, geographical aspect, the slaveholding and non-slaveholding States are actually tied in the Senate. Well, now, the Vice President of the United States, who is also the President of the Senate, whenever the Senate is tied on any question, has, under the constitution, the casting vote. So that in the event of any bill coming before that body inimical to the South, it would depend entirely on the Vice President whether it should become the law of the land or not. If, on the one hand, he is inimical to the South—if he is an abolitionist—of course he will give his casting vote to any measure, no matter how atrocious in its attack upon Southern institutions; whilst on the other hand, if he is a friend of the South—if he is disposed to do justice to the South, which is all the friendship she asks—he would, by the interposition of his influence and vote, vindicate her rights & her honor. With the Vice President, in all human probability, will rest, during the next four years, the power and the responsibility of deciding between the North and the South upon this, to us, "paramount" question.

Is MILLARD FILLMORE, the Federal candidate for the Vice Presidency, such a man as the South can support for an office, at all times so high and responsible, and which, at the present time, from the circumstances alluded to above, it is absolutely essential should be filled by a man entirely free from every TAIN of ABOLITIONISM?

We undertake to assert that, so far from Millard Fillmore being such a man, he is the very reverse—he is tainted to the core with ABOLITIONISM—HE IS AN ABOLITIONIST.

We shall endeavor, in this and subsequent numbers, to make this assertion good, by proofs taken from the public records of the country. We will open the ball with his votes in the House of Representatives, first session of the 26th Congress, on the celebrated ABERNETHY RESOLUTIONS.

If we do not prove from his votes on these resolutions alone, to the satisfaction of any reasonable man, that MILLARD FILLMORE is an ABOLITIONIST, then we can only say that we will be very much mistaken.

In the month of December, 1838, Mr. Atherton, of New Hampshire, moved that the rules be suspended so as to enable him to introduce some resolutions in reference to slavery in the States and Territories, and the proper disposition of all memorials, petitions, &c., on that subject, that might be introduced into Congress.

And on the question, shall the rules be suspended for the purpose aforesaid? "It passed in the affirmative—yeas 137, nays 65."

Southern whigs and democrats voted in favor of this motion, while John Quincy Adams, Thomas Corwin, MILLARD FILLMORE, Joshua R. Giddings, Peck, Parmenter, Slade, and the great body of the ABOLITIONISTS, voted against it.

The rule being suspended for the purpose, Mr. Atherton then moved his said resolutions, which were read.

After various motions for adjournment, &c., the question was put that the House do agree to the first of the said resolutions, being in the words following, viz: "Resolved, That this Government is a Government of limited powers; and that, by the Constitution of the United States, Congress has no jurisdiction whatever over the institution of slavery in the several States of the confederacy."

Of course this resolution was so plain, palpable, and contained a political axiom, the truth of which was so universally admitted, that out of 204 votes recorded, there were only 6 nays. The Federalists claim for Fillmore great credit in voting for this first resolution, and argue, therefore, that he is not an Abolitionist. The record shows that Giddings and Corwin, and other notorious ABOLITIONISTS, voted with him in the affirmative; so that this is no argument whatever. If, for so voting

in the affirmative, Fillmore is not an Abolitionist, then is Giddings, of Ohio, no Abolitionist.

On the 12th of the same month (December) the Atherton resolutions again came up for consideration.

"The question was then put that the House do agree to the said second resolution, which is in the words following, viz: "Resolved, That the institution of slavery in the District of Columbia and the Territories of the United States, and against the removal of slaves from one State to another, are a part of a plan of operations set on foot to affect the institution of slavery in the several States, and thus indirectly to destroy that institution within their limits."

"And passed in the affirmative—yeas 136, nays 65."

Now would it not appear to every Southern man that there was a chance when those who desired to exhibit their disposition to do justice to the South, might do so publicly and above-board, by voting for this resolution?—MILLARD FILLMORE and his Abolition allies and friends, Adams, Giddings, Corwin, Slade, &c., VOTED AGAINST this resolution. Mark this, Southern Whigs, who, under the influence of party associations, are about to cast your votes for this same Millard Fillmore.—Read the resolution and weigh it well, and ask yourselves what you would think of the sentiments of the man that voted against it. Is he an Abolitionist? We think you must answer, yea. But again—

"The question on the third resolution was, on the motion of Mr. Bond, divided: "And on the question that the House do agree to the first member of the said third resolution, being so much thereof as is contained in the words following: "Resolved, That Congress has no right to do that which it cannot do directly."

"It passed in the affirmative—yeas 170, nays 30."

Here, again, we find Millard Fillmore, the candidate of Southern Whigs for the Vice Presidency, voting in the negative, in close fellowship with his old friends, Adams, Slade, Giddings, Peck, &c.

"The question was then put that the House do agree to the second member of the said third resolution, being so much thereof as is contained in the words following: "And that the agitation of the subject of slavery in the District of Columbia or the Territories, as a means and with the view of disturbing or overthrowing that institution in the several States, is against the true spirit and meaning of the Constitution an infringement of the rights of the States affected, and a breach of the public faith on which they entered into this confederacy."

"And passed in the affirmative—yeas 164, nays 39."

Against this, also, we find John Quincy Adams, MILLARD FILLMORE, Joshua R. Giddings, Peck, and Slade, voting in the closest fellowship and agreement.

Now, how, in the name of common sense, can Southern men bring themselves to vote for a man for the Vice Presidency who would record his vote against such a proposition as this? Still, people of North Carolina, they (the Federal leaders) have the hardihood to ask you to vote for this man!

"The question recurred, that the House do agree to the fourth resolution. "Mr. Lincoln called for a division of the question on said resolution; and on the question that the House do agree to the first member thereof, being so much as is contained in the words following: "Resolved, That the Constitution rests on the broad principle of equality among the members of this confederacy. It passed in the affirmative—yeas 182, nays 26."

Of course, Millard Fillmore voted for such a proposition as this, as did many of the other Abolitionists. But how was it on the second clause of the same resolution? Let us see.

"The question was then put that the House do agree to the second member of the said fourth resolution, being so much thereof as is contained in the words following: "And that Congress, in the exercise of its acknowledged powers, has no right to discriminate between the institutions of one portion of the States and another, with a view of abolishing the one and promoting the other."

"And passed in the affirmative—yeas 174, nays 26."

Now, reader, what would you think of the feelings towards the South of a man who would vote against this proposition? Would you not say he was not to be trusted by southern people? And still we find, on referring to the journals, that the Federal candidate for the Vice Presidency, MILLARD FILLMORE, voted against this very resolution! With him voted the same old crew, Adams, Giddings, Slade & Co.

"The question recurred, that the House do agree to the fifth resolution. "Mr. Randolph called for a division of the question on said resolution; and on the question that the House do agree to the first member of said resolution, being so much thereof as is contained in the words following, viz: "Resolved, therefore, That all attempts on the part of Congress to abolish slavery in the District of Columbia or the Territories, or to restrict the removal of slaves from one State to another, or to discriminate between the institutions of one portion of the confederacy and another, with the views aforesaid, ARE IN VIOLATION OF THE CONSTITUTION, destructive to the fundamental principle on which the Union of these States rests, and to any extent whatever, to say an affront, or to diminish the honor of Congress."

"It passed in the affirmative—yeas 149, nays 52."

Surely, here it might be supposed that the Federal candidate for the Vice Presidency would have sustained for once the rights of the South by voting for this proposition. But did he do so? No. Millard Fillmore, in company with his old friends, Adams, Slade, Giddings & Co., voted AGAINST this proposition also! And still there are Southern Whigs who will have the effrontery to ask the people of the South to vote for Millard Fillmore!

"The question recurred, that the House do agree to the second member of the said fifth resolution, being so much thereof as is contained in the words following, viz: "And that every petition, memorial, proposition, or paper, touching, or relating, in any way, to any extent whatever, to slavery as aforesaid, or the abolition thereof, shall, on its presentation, be laid upon the table, without being debated, printed or referred; when

"A motion was made by Mr. Potts, that the said second member of the fifth resolution do lie upon the table. "And on the question that the House do agree to this motion, it passed in the negative—yeas 77, nays 135."

Now, we "pray you," how did this candidate of the Southern Whigs vote on this motion. Why, MILLARD FILLMORE voted with Adams, Giddings, Slade & Co., to lay this resolution on the table!

Now we "pray you" to examine these resolutions well, and the manner in which Fillmore voted, and then ask yourselves the question, "Is Millard Fillmore an Abolitionist?" If you consider that on these resolutions, declaratory of the rights of the South, that Fillmore always voted in the negative—if you consider the company in which he is found, that of the most notorious Abolitionists of the whole country—If, we say, you look at these

things calmly and candidly, you cannot; we think, do otherwise than answer, HE IS AN ABOLITIONIST.

We shall resume this subject next week.

TOM CORWIN'S TAYLORISM.—Every one who knows any thing about the Presidential election of 1840—the hard cider and log cabin campaign—must remember what tremendous federal gun was the famous "Tom Corwin, of Ohio." Every one knows that in that celebrated contest he did more to carry the State of Ohio for Harrison than, perhaps, any other living man. He has now, as we learn from our exchange papers, made a number of appointments to address the Taylorites of his State during the month of September, and whip them in to vote for Taylor, if he can. It may be interesting to the Southern Taylorites to know Mr. Corwin's reasons for supporting Gen. Taylor. Corwin, every body knows, is about as rank an abolitionist as in the Union. In the course of a speech against the South, delivered in his place in the Senate Chamber, on a recent occasion, the following passage occurs: "I declare, if anybody is concerned to know what is my opinion on the subject, and what is the opinion of the Free States of the Union, that if Gen. Taylor was not considered as being committed by his published letters against the exercise of the veto upon this subject, he would not get my vote, nor would he get the vote of a Free State in America, if I could help it."

"Mr. Hannegan.—I would like to be informed by the Senator from Ohio, as he has referred to Gen. Cass's position, and as he is about to vote for Gen. Taylor, if he can give us Gen. Taylor's views on the subject, and what his opinions will be as expressed in his message to Congress."

"Mr. Corwin.—I cannot."

"Mr. Hannegan.—I understood the Senator from Ohio to say that if Gen. Taylor would interpose a veto upon the subject, he would not vote for him under any circumstances."

"Mr. Corwin.—I would not, nor would a man in my State, unless indeed I found him opposed to just such another man who had a great many bad qualities besides. (A laugh.) But, sir, I have to say that I do not believe that Gen. Taylor could get the electoral vote of a free State in America, if it were not for the help of that party, that upon this subject as well upon every other of the character, he would not interpose his veto. If the Congress of the United States will that there shall be freedom from slavery for ever, and any man sitting in the White House dare interpose his veto against it, I will not say he will be taken through the forms of impeachment—there might be a more summary method found out of disposing of him."

Now, this is Gen. Taylor's Northern face. What do the people of North Carolina think of Senator Corwin's views of Taylorism and slavery? Singular that Gen. Taylor would permit himself to be supported thus in the North, without (if Mr. Corwin is not correct) undecieving the people of that region.

TAYLOR STOCK MARKET.—Not only in North Carolina and the other States that have just voted, is Taylor stock rapidly sinking below par. The Coons themselves are beginning to "fess the Corn." The New-York Courier & Enquirer—the great organ of the whig "deceit" of the city of New-York—thus discourses: "A REAL TALK FOR LIVE WHIGS.—(LIVE WHIGS, WE MEAN.)"—We have a few words of counsel for the whigs, in regard to the great contest so near at hand. They may not be welcome; they may be deemed impudently; but we believe there is a false and treacherous sentiment to be heard and heeded. Nothing is ever gained by shutting our eyes to facts. It may be more agreeable to sleep, in the belief that all is well—even when the enemy is at the door; but it is not safe, and he is a false and treacherous sentiment who will not, or dare not, sound the alarm."

We believe that, in the existing state of the public mind, without efforts on the part of the whigs to get forth, Lewis Cass is almost certain to be elected President in November next. We are compelled to this belief, most reluctantly, by what we see and know of the state of public feeling and the lack of proper effort. Doubt it, deny it, wish it otherwise as we may, the whig party, especially in the North, is apathetic, indifferently inactive, compared with what it should be, and with what it must be, if it expects to win the victory."

This is a very different key to that upon which the Courier pitched his voice a few weeks since.

The following we clip from the New-York Mirror, the oldest and staunchest Taylor paper in the North: "WHIGS OF NEW YORK.—If you don't want Lewis Cass for your President, you must go to work. We mean to 'tell the truth and shame the devil' (and the whigs, too, if we can) and we do not hesitate to say that every party of this city deserve defeat for their apathy."

"General Apathy" will be the death of the federal party. The truth is, that any little popularity that Gen. Taylor once possessed, is rapidly disappearing, despite all the efforts of the leaders. They can't get up the steam."

The following is from the Elyria Courier—the whig organ of Lorain county, Ohio: "Ohio all right."—We frequently see it stated in exchange papers, both from abroad and from portions of this State, "Ohio is all right, and will give a large vote for Taylor." This, we must be a mistake somewhere. The State may be carried for Taylor, but there is a cloud of uncertainty about it. In this county, but few of the whigs will vote for the nominee, and on the Reserve the whigs will not give a majority by several thousand. Taylor votes, there are numerous accessions to the southern portions of the State, Taylor loses Ohio. Politicians who deal in figures may regard this as a correct statement. We are not willing that our friends of the press should believe that the greatest unanimity prevails among the whigs of Ohio, when it is a fact that there never before was so much dissatisfaction and holding particularly in the northern portion of the State."

Now this is very cheering news for the whig parties. If their own papers can't conceal their fears, the prospect must be poor indeed, for old Zack. We have a few more extracts of the "same sort" left.

"GIVE THE PEOPLE LIGHT."—It is really too bad that Gen. Taylor has no less than three "organs" in Wilmington, and yet he must be indebted to a "Loco Foco" paper for giving publicity to his sentiments. We think this is treating Old Zack too badly. Several letters from his prolific pen, of a very interesting character, have recently made their appearance, and as yet the whig prints of this place have not treated them with even so much respect as to give them a place in their columns. Why is this gentlemen? We think that you ought at any rate, to have found room for the "Lippard" letter in which Gen. Taylor says he is not "a party candidate." The Charleston letter in which he says he would have accepted the nomination of the Baltimore convention, and the other and latest Charleston letter in which the old hero very emphatically accepts the nomination of a portion of the Democrats of the Queen City. Do, if you please, gentlemen, try and squeeze these interesting epistles into your papers. They ought to be very interesting to a number of your readers.

Taylor stock is 75 per cent below par.

WHY DID THE CHRONICLE GARBLE WHAT WE SAID IN REPLY TO HIS PARAGRAPH, HEADED "THE WILMOT PROVISIO A DEMOCRATIC MEASURE?"

We expressly stated in our article, that the Wilmot Proviso was introduced by David Wilmot and Preston King; but also added what the Chronicle knows as well as we do, that both these men are now in open opposition to the democratic party and its nominees, because that party, and these nominees would not go with them on the slavery question. Is this not so?

But does the Chronicle really know what the Wilmot Proviso is? We think he does not, or he never would be guilty of charging Gen. McKay and other Southern men of voting for it. The Wilmot Proviso, according to our reading, goes for the exclusion of slavery from any territory that we might acquire from Mexico. The Oregon bill that Gen. McKay and other Southern men—whigs as well as democrats—voted for, has no such proviso in it. Its 12th section merely extends the ordinance of 1787 over that Territory, all of which lies north of the Missouri Compromise line by five and one half degrees. If the Chronicle will only take the pains to examine the vote by which this bill (with the 12th section in it) was passed in the 29th Congress, he will find that Southern men of both parties voted for it—that indeed it was not then made a test question between the North and the South. If the Chronicle will look into the matter, he will find, that in the vote taken in the short session of the last Congress, there were only 35 nays recorded against the bill, out of a House containing upwards of two hundred members. This is the bill which passed the Senate on the 13th ultimo, and was signed by the President on the 14th ult. If the Chronicle has not gumption enough to distinguish between the 12th section of the Oregon bill, and the Wilmot Proviso, it is needless for us to discuss this matter.

Why does not the Chronicle and other federal papers let their readers see the reasons which Mr. Polk gives for signing the bill? Gen. McKay did say, when in Wilmington a few days ago, that he had voted for the Oregon bill in almost the same shape that it has now become the law of the land; but as we have said before, the 12th section of the bill is not the Wilmot Proviso. We know it is generally spoken of as the Wilmot Proviso, and we are perfectly willing to admit, that as applied to the Oregon territory, it is the Wilmot Proviso. But as we said before, the really—to us Southern people—obnoxious Wilmot Proviso went for the exclusion of slavery from ALL the Territories of the U. States—a very different thing from the proviso of the Oregon bill.

I have heard a good anecdote of the late election, which is as honorable to a Whig as it is characteristic of Locofocoism wherever it has full sway. At one of the precincts in New Hanover county, where whigs are usually scarce, an old gentleman came to the polls, to vote for Manly. He had no ticket, and no paper to write one on. The Locos present refused to give him either paper or pen and ink. He was not to be balked in that way. He walked four miles for paper to write a ticket on, obtained it, walked back again, and voted. In telling a friend of this occurrence, he added, that if he had been a younger man he would have had a light, for some of the Locos present wanted to whip him. Such is democracy! which professes to be the exclusive friend of the people, of freedom of opinion, and of Free Suffrage!

The above precious paragraph appears in a letter written at Saratoga (New York) by the Editor of the Fayetteville Observer, and published in that paper of the 29th ultimo. Now this is a very good illustration of the old adage—"Lies travel swift." Singular that no one here should have heard of this "singular incident." What precinct did this occur at? Will the Observer say? We say that it has not one particle of truth about it.

"Stick a Pin There."—The Journal denies, what every intelligent man in the country knows to be true, viz, that Gen. McKay and other southern democrats, voted for the Wilmot Proviso, in the Oregon bill—and "sticks a pin" upon the assertion. This is a favorite expression of the Journal, and if he continues to stick a pin into all his political lies, he will not have a pin left to stick into the truth—should he ever happen to stumble on a fact. Commercial of yesterday morning.

Strange that from a Federal paper, a Democrat can never get justice. We do most flatly deny that the Oregon bill contains the Wilmot Proviso. The Commercial knows that the Wilmot Proviso which went for excluding the southern States from all the territories of the Union, as well south as north of the Missouri compromise line, is both in spirit and in letter, a very different thing from the Proviso in the Oregon bill, merely excluding it from that territory, the whole of which lies far north of 36 30. For the Oregon bill, with this Proviso in it, Gen. McKay and other southern men, both whigs and democrats, did vote. Will the Federal papers state exactly what Gen. McKay did vote for? If they will do so, then we are perfectly willing to let it go for what it is worth.

ANOTHER PHASE AT GEN. TAYLOR'S NORTHERN FACE.—The Editor of the New Haven (Conn.) Journal, a rabid Taylorized Federal paper, pledges his veracity for the confidence that may be placed in the following letter addressed to him by a person whom he knows: "August 22d, 1848.

The confidence expressed by you in the leading article of your paper of yesterday, in regard to Gen. Taylor, in reference to the free soil question, is, I can assure you, well founded. A friend of mine, in whom I repose implicit confidence, had a conversation with the General on this subject last May, and in a letter to me, dated the 10th of that month, he reports that conversation in full. The ground taken by him is, that the ordinance of '87 having been passed by Congress, approved by Washington, and upheld by the judiciary, the constitutionality of the measure has been settled by all departments of the Government, and consequently there is no ground left for the interposition of the veto. He told me, that if he would neither veto the Wilmot Proviso, nor would he intrigue against it, nor do any thing to embarrass its passage through the two houses of Congress."

P. S. Since the above was in type, we have received the Union of Tuesday morning, in which we find a letter from a New Haven correspondent, who states that he (the correspondent) heard the Editor of the Journal state that the writer of the above article is the Hon. Truman Smith, a leading Whig member of Congress from Connecticut. We would most respectfully invite the attention of the "Rough and Ready Club" to this matter. We think it would furnish a very interesting topic for the consideration of their next meeting. We shall have more to say about this in our next.

Taylor stock is 75 per cent below par.

BACKING OUT.—The Cass and Butler Club of Wake County proposed that the respective Presidents of that and the Rough and Ready Club should jointly write to Gen. Taylor for an explicit exposition of his views with regard to the justice and propriety of the Mexican war in its commencement and prosecution, and also as to the Wilmot Proviso, whether he is in favor or against it. The Rough and Ready Club refused to join the Cass and Butler Club in addressing Old Zack. In a word, the Raleigh Taylorites back out from the proposition! They are afraid to let Gen. Taylor's opinions on any subject see the light. They say they are willing to take him on trust.

ANOTHER GROAN OF THE BRITAINS.—The Savannah Republican, the leading Federal paper of Georgia, thus discourses of the prospects of General Taylor in that State: "It is time we were at work, if we intend to give the vote of Georgia to Gen. Taylor. And here we would remark, that thus far in the canvass the Whig press has alone done its duty. The people seem to rely altogether upon the press and the popularity of their candidates. While our opponents are thus moving Heaven and earth to secure their own success and that of Gen. Cass, our friends are doing nothing. We do hope they will bestir themselves. If not we are beaten, and that to death."

They [the Locofocos] have had control of National affairs for about twenty years, have taken nearly all the honors and emoluments to themselves, and now the mere fear of being obliged to share with the Whigs throws them almost into spasms.—Chronicle of Wednesday.

If the Locofocos have been mistreating the country so terribly, how utterly devoid of discernment must the American people be to have suffered this for the long period of 20 years, when they could have so easily suppressed the evil?

THAT LEATHER MEDAL.—Whenever the Commercial shall announce the election of Gen. Taylor, then we shall entertain the proposition of presenting that leather medal.

THE FAYETTEVILLE OBSERVER DENIES THAT IT EVER OPPOSED FREE SUFFRAGE! Did not the Observer, before the election, call Free Suffrage "Reid's humbug?" We are not acquainted with these matters if this alone does not show that the Observer opposed the Free Suffrage "humbug."

TREMENDOUS GATHERING OF THE DEMOCRACY.—There was a gathering together of the Democracy of six or seven counties of Georgia, at the Stone Mountain in that State, on the 15th ult., which, for numbers, spirit and enthusiasm, has not been equalled by any mass meeting of either party during the present campaign. All accounts agree in putting down the number of those who were present at from fifteen to twenty thousand persons! Some of the first men of Georgia were there; amongst them Colquitt and Hall McAllister.

"Our neighbor" of the Commercial Review, in his issue of the 26th ult., says that "there was a vote taken during the last session of Congress, on the question of attaching the Wilmot Proviso to the Ore. on bill, and that Messrs. McKay, David S. Reid, and J. R. J. Daniel, of North Carolina, voted in favor of it." Now this we flatly deny, and call upon "our neighbor" either to produce the documents, or make the amende honorable. We presume our neighbor made this statement without first carefully examining the facts, and have no doubt he will do the thing that's right. Neither of the gentlemen above named ever voted for the Wilmot proviso. If our neighbor will state all the facts connected with the course of Senators Benton and Houston, on the Oregon bill, we are perfectly willing that the reading community shall draw their own conclusions, without a word said pro or con by us. Indeed we did publish the votes of these two Senators some time ago.

ARRIVAL OF THE BRITANNIA.—FOREIGN NEWS.—IRISH AFFAIRS.—In our paper of last Friday, we gave the news brought by the Acadia, and in a P. S. stated that a letter purporting to have been written in Dublin on the 3d of August had appeared in the New York Tribune, stating that a great battle had been fought between the Irish patriots and the Queen's troops, in which the latter had been defeated, with a loss of six thousand killed and wounded, and that Smith O'Brien was then at the head of 60,000 insurgents. At the time of communicating this, we gave it as our opinion that it was a "hoax." The intelligence brought by the Britannia fully confirms our suspicions. It was a most cruel hoax, the author of which should be held up to the severest reprobation of the public.

The Britannia sailed from Liverpool on the 12th ultimo. By the papers brought by her, we learn that no serious disturbance has taken place, with the exception of the affair of Ballynary, between some policemen and a few hundred insurgents. Smith O'Brien, the great Irish leader, has been actually arrested, and is at this moment a prisoner in Kilmalinham jail, Dublin. He was arrested at Thurles, and if the accounts before us be correct, he declared that he found the people unwilling even to harbor him, much less to sustain him, in his efforts to liberate his country.

The papers before us say that all idea of a concentrated rising of the people of Ireland is for the present at an end. A number of arrests of prominent Irish patriots have been made since the sailing of the Acadia. The intelligence from the other portions of Europe is not of any marked importance. Business in England was quiet. Cotton was firm, and the provision market was steady. The crops in England were not harvested at the sailing of the Britannia, and of course, the matter is still in doubt (dependent entirely on the weather) with regard to the future state of the breadstuff market. The accounts of the failure of the potato crop were daily multiplying, and it was feared that it would become general in the British Isles. We hope not.

With regard to the Irish news, we quote from the Baltimore Sun of Monday morning the following paragraphs, which express our feelings and views much better than we could otherwise do: "THE BRITANNIA'S NEWS.—The anxiously expected advices of the Britannia reached us yesterday morning, two or three of the principal facts having been flashed through by telegraph on Saturday. We may say in a word, that none unwelcome intelligence it has rarely fallen to the lot of a doomsday seer. It comes with the oppression of a doom upon the cheerful hopes which swept together into the future. But for how long? Wretched and wretched, and lashed to frenzy by ceaseless unrest, England can never possess the loyal heart of Ireland; the bond of her allegiance will be hereditary hate, and should such an alliance ever prove the bane of England, it will be the bitter ingredient in the cup of her adversity that she has mixed the potion with her own wanton, unrelenting hand."

In the Ohio Organ, published at Cincinnati, we find the following paragraph, which shows that Mr. Clay has not yet endorsed that note drawn at the Philadelphia Convention: "We were admitted to the perusal of a private letter of the day, from this distinguished statesman [Mr. Clay] to one of our leading citizens, in which he declares his determination not to take an active part in the present canvass; but when the day of election comes he will go to the polls and vote according to the best lights in his possession at the time."

Mr. Editor: I have read the address of Mr. Davis which you were so kind as to furnish me with this morning. I, of course, cannot object to Mr. Davis' adopting this course or any other which may appear to him proper, to dispel those dark and troublous clouds that are now gathering fast and thick over the horizon of modern Federalism. The great West and Northwest are rolling down from their Republican heights an avalanche of reprobation which, in its onward course, gathering new strength as it advances, will inevitably sweep from the face of our country the last remnant of that party organization—the only animating combining principle of which is found in its Democratic antipathies. What common principle actuates General Taylor and Millard Fillmore? The one, a large Southern slaveholder, and the other, a red hot Abolitionist, whose humane feelings are sorely anguished by the reading of publications in the newspapers of the country, "of notices" for the sale of negroes. Can I be accused of doing Mr. Fillmore injustice? Was he not elected to the office he now holds in the State of New York by a combination of the Whigs and Barnburners, who are acknowledgeably the Abolition portion of the North. "Birds of a feather flock together." Read Mr. McCallister's testimony. Is it not positive and direct that he heard this same, this identical Mr. Fillmore, make an Abolition speech in the State of New York, in which, assuming the garb of a false-hearted philanthropist, he railed bitterly against the South and Southern institutions. Read the testimony of the Hon. Henry A. Wise, who served with Mr. Fillmore during several sessions of Congress, and who does not hesitate to class him among those political fanatics who, like Sampson, are willing to pull down the pillars of our constitutional temple, even if they be involved in its destruction. But democracy is to be put down, and our opponents are perfectly indifferent in their choice of means adequate for their fell purpose. Much of Mr. Davis' address is consumed in heaping fire-coals of wrath on the head of Col. Polk; what advantages are to result in the determination of the present canvass from holding up to public execration the administration of Col. Polk, I cannot conceive; yet let us examine the justice of the accusation. The democratic party, in the year 1844, held at Baltimore a National Convention, the labors of which resulted in the nomination of Col. Polk for the Presidency. The Convention at the same time published and made known to the American people the measures which the democratic party, if successful in the election, would put in operation. The American people, with their eyes wide open—with a full and perfect knowledge of what the democratic party would do if installed into power, determined that they should be installed—that they should have the reins of Government entrusted to their guidance. Do our opponents dare to say that we did not fulfill our promise to the letter? We promised to annex Texas. It was done. We promised to establish the Independent Treasury. It was done. We promised to separate the fiscal operations of the country from the influence of monied corporations. Was it not done? We declared, in our opinion, it was improper to impose high and onerous taxes on the masses, either for the purpose of extending protection to manufacturing monopolies, or with the view of filling our national Treasury, in order to waste its funds on such works of internal improvements as the General Government had no right to accomplish. Was not the first of these objects completely effected by the tariff bill of 1846 and did not Mr. Polk, by his interposition of his veto,—this much execrated "one man power"—completely prostrate that gigantic scheme of internal improvements by the General Government, which was as ruinous to our interest as it was destructive of the constitution. These great & salutary measures were all effected under the auspicious administration of Col. Polk. Do they not form a lasting monument of fame, of which he may well feel proud? It was my duty four years since to canvass this District as a Democratic Elector. I feel confident that no promise was made by me at that time, in behalf of Col. Polk, which has not been fulfilled. Should I feel backward, then, in saying of him, "well done thou good and faithful servant?" I will not have time at present to enter into an elaborate examination of the veto power. The American people passed judgment on this matter four years since. They then decided that it was one of the elementary principles which entered into the formation of our government,—that it was potent for good; being, in the language of Gen. Taylor, "highly conservative," but harmless for evil. It was not perfectly conversant with all the affairs of the Federal party, it would be a matter of surprise to me that they should execrate so warmly this use of the veto power, when exercised by the President, the great popular representative, who is elected by the people of the several States, and who is immediately responsible to them for misconduct or maladministration in office, when they view with the greatest satisfaction the exercise of a similar power in the hands of the Judiciary, the members of which are not elected by the people—are not responsible for misconduct to the people, and hold their official situations for life. Strange inconsistency! Only to be understood by those who know the secret springs of that party.

Mr. Davis leaps with wonderful agility from off the "dead carcass" of Col. Polk (poor Polk, how I pity him) to the shoulders of Gen. Cass. The charges which are aggregated together with great ingenuity against Gen. Cass are such, and such only as the Federal press has been teeming with ever since his nomination. As often as they have been published, they have been flatly contradicted and completely disproved; yea, annihilated. We may well say of each of them, "statu vivra nominis."

Mr. Davis appears to be at considerable loss to know what causes kept the Whigs of North Carolina at home on the last election day; and in order to animate them to exert against the "ides of November," he holds up to their admiration the conduct of Mr. Clay, "the great exemplar of Whig faith," whose whole life has been devoted to the cause, and whose voice henceforth will be only heard as "the oracle" of history. Now is not this "glib" Mr. Clay the "cold shoulder" with vengeance! Is it not well known to Mr. Davis that Mr. Clay has refused to endorse the political orthodoxy of Gen. Taylor, playfully saying "that a note should be signed before"

Mr. Editor: I have read the address